



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

*Sources of the Philosophy of the Upaniṣads.*—By FRANKLIN EDGERTON, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

The more I study the Upaniṣads, the more I become impressed with two things:

1. The Upaniṣads as a whole proclaim no philosophical system, nor anything that even remotely resembles a single, unified philosophical system. And:

2. Every idea contained in at least the older Upaniṣads, with almost no exceptions, is not new to the Upaniṣads, but can be found set forth, or at least *very* clearly foreshadowed, in the older Vedic texts.

Neither of these propositions is new. Probably most occidental scholars would subscribe to both. Yet—to speak of the first proposition first—there is noticeable in our standard authorities an almost irresistible tendency to systematize and correlate the things that are said in the Upaniṣads—things which, as I hold, are to a very large extent incapable of being systematized and correlated. This tendency appears not only in such Hindu philosophers as Čaṃkara, who assumes in advance that the Upaniṣads are school-texts of the Vedānta philosophy, and, Procrustes-like, makes them fit that pattern, frequently in defiance of the plain meaning of the passages. It is only somewhat less prominent in Deussen, who must needs construct for the Upaniṣads a system centering about the *Bráhmaṇ-Ātmán*, interpreted in terms of Schopenhauer. I have a great admiration for the work of Deussen, which in fact I consider almost the only existing careful and detailed treatment of Upaniṣadic thought which is worthy of serious consideration. But valuable as the work is, it suffers severely from this over-systematization, and especially from the introduction of Schopenhauerian ideas which are wholly foreign to the originals. Among these I am constrained to count Deussen's monstrous (no other word will suffice) definition of the *original* meaning of the word *bráhmaṇ*—'the Will of Man as it strives upward to the Holy, the Divine' ('der zum Heiligen, Göttlichen emporstrebende Wille des Menschen').<sup>1</sup> Deussen is not so blind as to maintain that this is the universal meaning of the word when used philosophically, nor is he so philologically

---

<sup>1</sup> Allgemeine Geschichte der Philosophie, 1. 1, p. 241.

foolish as to try to explain away the passages where it does not mean that (à la Çamkara); but he holds that in such passages the Hindus hav fallen from grace, hav proved untru to the originally lofty concept of the *bráhman*. And this is characteristic of his general interpretation of the Upaniṣads. In so far as they do not fit into his assumption of what their 'original' or 'primary' doctrin is, he thinks they hav fallen from grace, departed from a previously occupied loftier position.

Now as to *bráhman*, while I should not wish to be forst to define its original meaning, I am certain that it was not 'der zum Heiligen, Göttlichen emporstrebende Wille des Menschen,' nor anything remotely suggested by such words. If, in the course of the development of Indian thot, it finally comes to hav a connotation not so very far removed from Deussen's definition, that can only be a late and secondary development; and it is certainly not (as it seems to me) characteristic of the older Upaniṣads.

And as with the meaning of the individual word *bráhman*, just so it is with the thot of the Upaniṣads as a whole. Deussen finds 'den eigentlichen Geist der Upaniṣadlehre' in the Vedāntic Idealism, which he sees fully develop in the oldest Upaniṣads—inclusiv of the doctrin of the unreality of the empiric world (*māyā*), which, he insists, characterizes the oldest and purest form of Upaniṣad teachings.<sup>2</sup> Of course he recognizes—and sets forth very fully, and with all his customary sharpness of insight and depth of erudition—that it is only comparatively seldom that this 'Idealism' is clearly and consistently set forth. But all the passages which ar inconsistent with it—and whose doctrins he pigeonholes under the convenient tags of 'Panteism,' 'Cosmogonism,' 'Theism,' 'Atheism,' and 'Deism'—all these he regards as degenerations of the original and fundamental idea, or rather instances of falling-away from it, due to the feebleness and frailty of the human intellect, which was frequently unable to hold fast to that lofty summit of idealistic filosofy.

I may say in passing that I cannot agree with Deussen in finding this Vedāntic Idealism, fully develop, at all in the older Upaniṣads. I mean specifically in the Bṛhad-Āraṇyaka or the Chāndogya, which ar usually (and without any question rightly) regarded as the oldest. I do not believ that the doctrin of *māyā*—of the unreality of the empiric universe—appears in

<sup>2</sup> Op. cit. 148 ff., 206 ff.

them at all, except in one or two verses now imbedded in the Brhad-Āraṇyaka, which all scholars, including Deussen himself, agree in considering later interpolations. When the Brhad-Āraṇyaka and the Chāndogya say that 'there is really only One that is, in very truth,' or words to that effect, they do not mean that the Many have no existence; that was a further step that was taken only later. What they do mean it would take too long to discuss in this paper. It is the less necessary to dwell on this question, whether the *māyā*-doctrin is found in the oldest Upaniṣads, for the reason that it has been fully and ably discussed, and to my mind conclusively decided in the negative, by Professor Oldenberg, in his latest book.<sup>3</sup>

Anyhow, this is a digression. What I am now discussing is not whether Deussen is right or wrong as to the exact age of some particular doctrin. It is rather the general point of view which he sets forth, that the Upaniṣads contain fundamentally a System—from which they frequently fall away, to be sure, but which is always more or less present in the background or as a starting-point. Reading Deussen on the Upaniṣads you never are allowed to forget the doctrin which to him is '*der eigentliche Geist der Upaniṣadlehre*'—namely, that the one and only reality is the individual human soul.

Now to my mind there is no such definite doctrin of which it could be said that it is '*der eigentliche Geist der Upaniṣaden*.' The genuine spirit of the Upaniṣads as a whole may be said to express itself in a general tendency—rather an unconscious and blind urging than a settled fact or a deliberate argument—to search for some one single unitary principle, on the basis of which, in some way or other, the multifariousness of the world as it presents itself to us may be explained—or at least which may, by its very existence, constitute a sort of bond of union between the individual parts of that multifariousness. But is not this '*der eigentliche Geist*' of almost all philosophy? Genuinely dualistic or pluralistic systems of philosophy are hard to find; the classical Indian Sāṃkhya may perhaps be regarded as an almost isolated example. To say, then, that the Upaniṣads generally seem to be seeking for a unitary principle of reality, is scarcely more than to say that they are interested in philosophic problems. And any narrower or more exact definition of the 'genuine spirit of the

<sup>3</sup> *Die Lehre der Upanishaden und die Anfänge des Buddhismus*, 1915 (p. 89 ff.).

Upaniṣads' would fail to describe properly the attitude of the Upaniṣads as a whole. In short, as soon as we ask how the Upaniṣads conceive this One Principle or Thing, and what its relations are to the empiric universe, we find the most varied answers. The Upaniṣads have no permanent point of view in regard to these questions, but on the contrary are constantly shifting the viewpoint—constantly reconsidering and attacking from new angles the same old problem. They are tentative and experimental, not fixed and final. They are philosophy in the making. They never seem to feel that they have found the ultimate truth. Or if they seem momentarily to feel so from time to time, one only needs to read on to the next paragraph to find that the position assumed with a semblance of satisfaction and finality is given up, and another position, wholly inconsistent with the former, is assumed with regard to the same problem. And this fluidity or fluctuation is the essential thing about them. It is not to be regarded as departure from a norm. There is no norm to depart from.

The names for the One found in the Upaniṣads—which is another way of saying the ways in which the authors try to formulate It and its relation to the world and to themselves—are numerous. We are told in all the books—latest of all in Oldenberg<sup>4</sup>—that the two names *brāhman* and *ātman* are so predominantly the favorites that other expressions are negligible in comparison. I cannot find that this is so, at least in the older Upaniṣads. It is true that *brāhman* and *ātman* are both common expressions for the One. Perhaps no other single expression is as common as either *brāhman* or *ātman*. Nevertheless, the idea is expressed in a large variety of other ways, the collective number of whose occurrences would perhaps considerably exceed the combined number of occurrences of *brāhman* and *ātman*. I have collected no statistics on this point, as yet; I am here stating my own impression merely. But take a single instance—the very famous Sixth Prapāthaka of the Chāndogya Upaniṣad—famous perhaps principally because it contains the always-quoted *tat tvam asi* (a phrase, by the way, which is often mistranslated, and whose importance I think is overrated).<sup>5</sup> This is a passage of

<sup>4</sup> Op. cit., p. 44 ff.

<sup>5</sup> The entire phrase is: *sa ya eṣa aṇimā, āitadātmyam idaṃ sarvaṃ, tat satyam, sa ātmā, tat tvam asi gvetaketo*, 'what that subtle essence is, a state-of-having-that (-*aṇimā*)-as-its-essence is this universe, that is the Real, that is the Soul (Self, human soul), that (*aṇimā*, subtle essence) art

some length, and is all about the One, its nature, and its relation to the world and to man. The word *brāhman* does not once occur in its entire length, and tho the word *ātman* occurs, it can hardly be said to occur as a name for the One. As used in this passage *ātman* means rather the human soul, simply—the self, in the old original sense of the word. The favorite—and I may fairly say exclusiv—name for the One in this passage is *Sat*—the Existent (also described as *sa aṇimā*, ‘that subtle essence’).

Much is made of the equation *brāhman* = *ātman*, interpreted as meaning world-soul = individual soul, and usually said to constitute the corner-stone of Upaniṣad teachings. Without denying the importance of this equation, I think it should be remembered that an equation of this or any other kind is by no means such a serious and important matter to the Vedic Hindus as it is to us. In the Brāhmaṇas, as Deussen says, ‘alles mögliche wird mit allem möglichen gleichgesetzt.’ And this tendency to endless—and usually very shallow—identifications of everything possible with everything else possible is quite as prominent in what we call the filosofic passages as anywhere else—from the filosofic hymns of the Atharva Veda, clear thru to the Upaniṣads. In particular, names which are intended to be applied to the One are constantly identified with all other known names that had previously been suggested for the same concept. Thus, to mention one early example, in the Rohita hymn, AV. 13. 2, vs. 39, we are told—

*rōhitāḥ kālō abhavad rōhitō 'gre prajāpatiḥ*

‘Rohita was Time, Rohita was Prajāpati in the beginning’; and in adjacent verses of this hymn, as in the other Rohita hymns, Rohita—here the Supreme One—is identified with numerous other things and concepts, some filosofical, some not. In short, for a Hindu to say that one thing equals another doesn’t in itself mean much; and as far as the early Upaniṣads are concerned, I do not find that the equation of *brāhman* with *ātman* is so common or so pointed as to justify any other inference than that both these words are familiar expressions for the One—along with many others.

---

thou, Ç.’ The frase is frequently represented as meaning ‘thou art (the) That,’ as if *Tat* were itself (as it sometimes is) a name for the One; but here *tat* is simply an ordinary demonstrativ pronoun, referring back to *aṇimā*.

The fact is, I believ, that no one would hav thot of giving this all-surpassing prominence to the *bráhmaṇ* and the *ātmán*—as individual expressions—in the older Upaniṣads, at any rate, were it not for the fact that later Hindu filosofy—the Vedānta especially—makes so much of them. Now this fact undoubtedly makes the erly history of these two words exceptionally interesting from the point of view of the development of Hindu filosofy as a whole. But if our object is to get an accurate idea of the thot of the *Upaniṣads*, we ought, it seems to me, to invoke the aid mainly of erlier—rather than later—stages of thot, in supplementing and interpreting the Upaniṣads themselvs.

Which brings me to my second proposition—that ther is scarcely anything in the older Upaniṣads which is not also found—sometimes in a more primitiv form—in the filosofic texts of the older Vedic literature. To show how extensivly this is tru, I am preparing a sort of card-index of the filosofic ideas and expressions in the Vedic Saṃhitās, Brāhmaṇas, and older Upaniṣads. When finisht this wil, I believ, be a definitiv collection of sources for the filosofic ideas of erly India. It is alredy sufficiently advanst that I feel safe in predicting that it wil completely establish the truth of my proposition of the close dependence of the Upaniṣads on the older Vedic filosofy. This proposition, if once firmly establisht, should, it seems to me, hav at least one immediate and practical result of prime importance; it should put a definit end to the strange theory advanst by Garbe and accepted by Deussen, that the filosofic thot of the Upaniṣads is a product of the warrior caste and is genetically unrelated to the old ritualistic speculations of the Brahmanas. I think my collection wil sho that there would be as much reason for ascribing *kṣatriya* authorship to many hymns of the Rig and Atharva Vedas, and to many passages in the Yajur Vedas and Brāhmaṇas.

More than this could of course be said against the theory of the *kṣatriya* origin of the Upaniṣads. But perhaps it may seem like slaying the ded to dwel on it further at present, especially in view of the fact that it seems now to be rejected by practically evryone.<sup>6</sup>

Let me then illustrate very briefly how such a complete and comprehensiv survey of erly Vedic filosofy wil illuminate the subject in other ways.

---

<sup>6</sup> Most lately by Oldenberg, op. cit., p. 166 ff.

The general plan of the work, in so far as it deals with attempts to get at the concept of the One, will be this. I shall first enumerate and quote attempts to formulate the One Being *in relation to the empiric world*—with subdivisions such as these: Temporal relations (First, Most Ancient; including in itself Past, Present, and Future; Time itself; concrete units of time, as Year, Day and Night, etc.); Spatial relations (Supreme, Highest; Foundation, Support, Bottommost; All-inclusiv, extending beyond all; Boundless, Infinit); Causal relations (Causa Efficiens or Creator; Causa Materialis or All-stuff; Uncaused, Unborn, Self-existent, etc.); relations as of Rulership (Ruler, Controller, Lord, etc.); Theological or Deistic relations (Sole God; Giver of Life, Strength, and other Boons); Intellectual relations (Knower of evrything; All-wise; Seer, etc.); and finally, the relation of Identity, or Strict Monism (the One *is* All).—Secondly, the collection will take up the attempts to formulate the One as Absolute *Ding an Sich*—to get at its own nature *in terms of itself*, and not in relation to other things. Here we shall find the subdivisions along such lines as these: Fysical concepts as First Principles (Water, Fire [with Sun, Heat], Wind or Air, Ether—and finally combinations of more than one fysical element as component parts of the universe); Psychological or quasi-psychological concepts (Man, *Puruṣa*; Desire; Mind, etc.; *Prāṇa*; and others, leading up to *Ātmán*); Ritualistic concepts (Holy Speech, *Vāc*; *Brhaspati*; *tapas*; Sacrifice; sacrificial animals and other offerings; *Brahmacārin*, and others, leading up to *Brāhman*); Metafysical and Mystical Concepts (Existent and Non-existent; the One; That (*Tat*); *Idam* and *Sarvam*, This, All; *Yakṣa*, ‘Wonder’; Secret, etc.).

Such, in a very brief and general way, is the plan of my Index of Ideas of Vedic Philosophy. I have already indicated what I hope will be the general result of it—a broadening and deepening of the current stock of knowledge of early Indian philosophy as a whole, and especially a clear and final demonstration of the intimate relation between the Upaniṣads and their predecessors. I will close with one concrete instance. In the outline plan here presented I referred to fysical concepts as tentative First Principles. We saw for instance that of the five later elements, earth, air, fire, water, and ether, all but the first, earth, are more or less clearly suggested as First Principles in the early Vedic texts. At least two of these elements, namely wind, or air, and



ether, ar so used in the Upaniṣads. Thus, Brh U. 3. 7. 6: 'Wind, in sooth, O Gāutama, is that thred, for by wind as by a thred this world and the other world and all creatures ar knit together.' Ch U. 1. 8: after a conversation between three Brahman, in which various Ultimates ar suggested and rejected, the Ether (*ākāṣa*) is declared to be the true Ultimate; (9) 'for all these beings arise out of the ether and return unto the ether again; for the ether is older than they, and the ether is their final resort (goal).'

In view of such passages—which ar by no means isolated—how can Oldenberg<sup>7</sup> maintain that 'none of the powers which tend towards the All-being belongs to the relm of fysical nature'? Oldenberg in this case seems to hav simply accepted the traditional statement, that the great distinction between erly Greek and erly Hindu filosofy is that the Greeks started with fysical elements, and the Hindus never did. Even Deussen, who collects a number of passages from the Upaniṣads in which fysical expressions for the One occur, cannot believ that they ar ment literally, but holds that they ar 'symbolic' expressions,<sup>8</sup> whatever that may mean. I hold—and I think I can prove—that they ar to be understood quite literally, and that they ar precisely analogous to the speculations of the erly Ionic filosofers. It is indeed a curious coincidence that the erliest fysical element to be used in this way is, in both Greece and India, water. In the filosofic hymns of the Rig Veda, already, water is more or less clearly conceivd as the primal principle. It continues to crop out in the same way occasionally thruout the Brāhmaṇa period. By the time of the Upaniṣads, to be sure, it seems to hav been practically eliminated from filosofic discussion. But in Greece, too, it is only Thales, the first of the Ionic school, who teaches that water is the original element; his successor Anaximander alrely sets up a much more abstract principle, 'the Infinit.' And as Anaximenes, the third of the Ionic school, found in Air a more subtle element, and so a more suitable one for use as the first principle, so the Hindus of later times, while not entirely giving up the idea of a fysical element, preferd Air or Wind (*Vāyu*, *Vāta*), or the stil more subtle Ether (*ākāṣa*), to the grosser water.

---

<sup>7</sup> Op. cit. p. 45.

<sup>8</sup> Op. cit. p. 91 ff.